DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 739 EA 002 001

Evaluation of the Instructional Program. A Position Paper.
Illinois Elementary School Principals' Association, Springfield.
Pub Date Jul 68
Note-14p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.80
Descriptors-Effective Teaching, *Elementary Schools, *Evaluation, *Instructional Programs, *Principals, *Teacher Evaluation, Teacher Supervision

This position paper is designed to aid elementary school principals in the evaluation of instructional programs. Arguments are based on the premises that (1) evaluation should be unique for each teacher, (2) teachers should be actively involved in evaluation, (3) evaluation should be cooperative and supportive in nature, (4) the ultimate objective of evaluation is improved instruction and not a rating of teachers, and (5) evaluative attempts should not become preoccupied with evaluation of teachers at the expense of teaching. Goals proposed for evaluation include individual improvement of teachers and teaching, assessment of strengths and weaknesses of the staff and educational program, analysis of problem areas needing attention, and prescription of individual and group activities. Essential elements in the evaluation of teachers and the evaluation of teaching are presented in separate columns. A bibliography lists 27 selections on evaluation. (TT)

ED026739

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Evaluation Of The Instructional Program

A Position Paper Developed

by the

Illinois Elementary School
Principals' Association

July, 1968

EA 002 001

Foreword

This position paper on the evaluation of the instrutional program developed through a series of meetings throughout the state of Illinois in 1967-'68. This study was authorized by the Board of Directors of the Illinois Elementary School Principals' Association as a part of their program of the Professional Development Committee.

Professional Development Committee

ARTHUR HELLING *(Chairman)*
ROBERT ALDRICH
MARY HELEN BYRNE
HAROLD HATHAWAY
JOHN MCGILL
WALTER MIFFLIN
MARLIN RECHKEMMER
HAROLD WYMAN

By and large, instruction for countless years, has been based on the stimulus—response kinds of learning. Innovative practices may base instruction on other kinds of learning. There is much discussion on process vs. content—as educational leaders, we ought to be able to say, "This is good because - - -" or, "We question this procedure because - - -".

In order to continue to really improve instruction, there must be continuous evaluation. This report may give some insight and guidelines for you in evaluation of instruction in your school.

ROBERT E. ALDRICH,
President IESPA

Introductory Statement

The purpose of this instrument is to aid you in your important responsibility of evaluation of the instructional program in your school. Please note that several key premises underlie the structure of the paper. They are (1) Evaluation should be unique for each teacher; (2) Teachers should be actively involved in evaluation; (3) Evaluation should be cooperative and supportive and two-way in nature; (4) The ultimate objective of evaluation is improved instruction and not a rating of teachers; and (5) Evaluative attempts should not become preoccupied with evaluation of teach*ers* at the expense of teach*ing*. There are others, but these represent the key precepts.

This paper represents the establishment of *a* position. You, the elementary principals, have a rationale, implied roles, and guidelines from which to establish your *own* position paper. THIS MUST BE DONE if you are to have any internalized concept of evaluation of instruction and your supervisory staff; to do less, places you in the unenviable position of not defining your own supervisory paramenters and not accepting responsibility for your own self-assessment and professional growth.

It is hoped that you and your colleagues will discuss the potential utility of this instrument for your school or district. It is not intended to be applied directly to any given situation in its complete form. It is the hope of this group that you, along with your professional staff, will modify the instrument in any way that will make it of greatest use to you.

Evaluation of Instruction Committee

AL BOYSEN
MICHAEL WILEY
EVA HONN
MARLIN RECHKEMMER
KENNETH GLOVER
DONALD UPHOFF
ROSE GAMMILL

The Sub-Committee on Evaluation of the Instructional Program

WILLIAM LEGGE *(Chairman)*
JAMES MCHANEY
TOM SERGIOVANNI
ALICE SPECK
OWEN SPRINGER
ROBERT STOREY
GLENN SWICHTENBERG
(Member of Professional Development Committee)

ILLINOIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS ASSOCIATION

Evaluation of Instruction

(A Position Paper)

Assumptions and beliefs

The efforts of the Committee on the Supervisory Role of the Elementary Principal of the Illinois Elementary School Principals Association have been guided by a set of assumptions and beliefs which seemed to permeate the discussions and were considered essential in order to place this statment in a common perspective. The assumptions are, by necessity, stated parsimoniously, and although they are numbered, it should not be inferred that they are ranked in order of importance; the significance of any assumption is relative to its relationship to other assumptions as the reader accepts or rejects them.

1. *Teaching is a process which includes (1) an in-put, (2) a through-put, and (3) an out-put.* In-puts to the teaching process include purposes, teachers and students. Through-puts include the teaching act, the curriculum, strategies, and teaching devices. Out-puts refer to the accumulation of student, as well as teacher, learnings; changed behavior and attitudes. Valid assessment of the teaching process requires that one recognize the complexity of teaching and attempt to view the process as a whole or totality. For analytical purposes, it is particularly useful, however, to view the components of the teaching process separately. The committee has purposely made a distinction between teach*ing* and teach*er*. Evaluation of teaching refers to those aspects of the teaching process which can be readily and objectively observed. Teaching may be compared from student to student, teacher to teacher and room to room. Although teach*ing* is dependent upon the teach*er*, teaching is readily observed, recorded and analyzed, while virtually ignoring (or controlling) the teach*er* variable. Teach*er* evaluation refers to those human and professional qualities which are reflected in teaching. Teacher evaluation tends to be subjective but necessary, yet hazardous.

2. *There are many ways to teach well. Different teacher types (i.e., personality types) may have similar results on students.* Therefore, the evaluations of teacher and teaching cannot ignore the effects they have on children. Some out-puts of the teaching process are manifest (readily observable), while others are latent (appear over a period of time).

3. *The evaluative process is a continuous one.* Acceptance of this assumption or principle implies that the evaluation process occurs often and on a systematic basis. Evaluation as a continuing process is a generally accepted principle but is frequently ignored in practice.

4. *The development of the professional teaching staff requires that principals emphasize "reality" in teaching and avoid using the "ideal teacher" as an image or reference point.* Performance improvement starts with what *is* and moves gradually from this point. Once the teachers and the principal agree on what *is*, the shift to what *ought to be* follows. Individual self-development by teachers should be the focus of the evaluation process.

5. *There is no inherent conflict between the evaluative process and the performance improvement process.* Authorities have indicated that conflict exists between the consultant-supervisory role of the principal and his evalu-

ation-critic role. That conflict *may* exist is not denied; that conflict *must* exist is misleading. Conflict diminishes as the proper climate and commitment to authenticity increase.

6. *Protection and support of one's concept of self is a basic need of all individuals.* Whatever a person does makes sense to *him*. As a result, we become servants to our ideas and beliefs and are compelled to behave consistently with these ideas. A change of strategy which ignores or threatens the concept of self is, by definition, hazardous. Changing patterns of teaching require that one broaden the teacher perception of his self to include alternate patterns of behavior. Merely pointing out deficiencies and prescribing corrections may violate the teacher's concept of self; this kind of behavior may cause the principal to find that teacher cooperation is given grudgingly, if at all.

7. *Moving from class to class and from teacher to teacher as a strategy for teacher evaluation is, at best, piecemeal and relies heavily on the building principal as the supervisor.* Such a procedure may, at times, be necessary, but the power of the evaluation process can be substantially increased by shifting to involvement and group strategies. Such a shift recognizes the power of groups to initiate, accept and reinforce changes in teaching patterns and curricular formats. It also has the potential to maximize the involvement of the teaching staff in evaluation and provides a professional commitment for individual self-development and for program improvement.

8. *The concept of readiness, accepted for pupils, applies as well to teachers.* The appropriate evaluation strategy to be used is dependent upon the sophistication and the readiness of the teaching staff; for some teachers, involvement may be threatening or may resemble "the blind leading the blind"; for others, the traditional patterns of supervision may be viewed as paternalistic or authoritarian. Success of any supervisory plan is largely dependent upon its acceptance by the teachers. Since the needs of teachers vary substantially, the perceptive principal is ready to employ a number of strategies simultaneously.

9. *Because of the complexity of evaluation, this position statement should not be viewed as a program of evaluation or a set of absolute specifications for the evaluation process.* It serves best as a screen through which individual principals may find help in examining themselves, their beliefs and their supervisory behavior.

10. *The school clients, in the final analysis, become the indices of the effectiveness of the educational program.* A valid process of evaluation cannot ignore the amount or the kind of children's learnings, the emotional health of children and an assessment of the total school climate.

Scope of evaluation of instruction

Instruction in a public elementary school should be evaluated in terms of the total educational program. In such an undertaking, the assessment of the inter-relationships, values, and contributions of each subject or instructional area is made. These studies are essential in evaluating any elementary school in terms of the purposes it is expected to serve and the objectives it attempts to accomplish. The establishing of balance in the curriculum and determining the effectiveness and efficiency of the overall program of the school building or unit (or even the school system) are objectives of program evaluation. Community and teacher consensus studies, curriculum studies, surveys and testing programs are used in such evaluations. Studies

of how well students do in their future educational endeavors, as well as in the political, social and economic worlds, are used as measures of quality. Delineating the specific contribution that "schooling" makes to these achievements becomes most difficult and suspect.

In a sense, instruction can be evaluated by measuring the competency or growth of individual pupils or groups of pupils in a subject or instructional area. Objectives of instruction, either short-term or long-range, become the criteria for evaluation; the individuality of teachers and the unique features of each level of instruction are considered in the evaluation process. These practices tend to emphasize the *quantitative* aspects of instruction and tend to limit the assessment of attitudes and values which are transmitted or developed in instructional settings. Inter-action analysis can be undertaken, and other teacher-pupil and pupil-pupil relationships can be observed and analyzed. Pupil evaluations of teachers and rating or checklists can be used for "rating" a teacher, and, as if often rumored, change observations of other teachers, administrators, and parents, as well as remarks by pupils, serve as evidence of evaluation. To suggest that evaluation cannot take place denies that it does take place—at least informally and unofficially, if not formalized.

Evaluation of instruction poses a problem of separating the assessment of teach*ing* from the assessment of the teach*er*. It is recognized that the inter-relationship of these two aspects makes separating them most difficult; it necessitates defining good teaching, as well as determining which teacher variables contribute and which do not contribute to instruction. Some perspective needs to be established for assessing instruction in terms of the teacher and teaching frames of reference. Shall these attributes be viewed only from the perspective of the teacher? Or the pupil? Or his parents? Or the community? Or the administrator? Or of "good education"? Or, is it desirable, even necessary, to assess instruction from the multiple perspective?

Another alternative to evaluation of instruction is to focus on what the teacher's purposes for any instructional segment (unit, lesson or micro-lesson) are and view them in a milieu of contingent variables. These variables include the abilities of the students, the instructional materials and equipment available to the teacher, and the classroom and community environments. Within the limits of these variables, the experience and training of the teacher, his personal and educational skills, and his knowledge contribute to this potential competency. The purpose of this approach to evaluation is the improvement of every teacher's instruction through mutually accepted approaches to self-assessment by the teacher. The role of the elementary principal in facilitating self-assessment is primary to improving instruction.

Evaluation of instruction does take place. The purpose of this position paper is to professionalize the evaluation process and focus its purpose on improving classroom instruction and hence, the total school program.

The principal's role and responsibility

The literature concerning the preparation of the elementary principal, his functions and roles, has stressed his responsibility for instructional leadership and supervision. These have recently been questioned as legitimate functions of the elementary principal because of the increasing demands on his time for the maintenance taske of his position. Some authorities question

the competency of the elementary principal to "supervise", since he "cannot know all" about any subject or teaching method. These criticisms are based on an assumption that belies the inter-relationship of maintenance with program development and upon a narrow definition of supervision, i.e., super vision. It is the purpose of this position paper to indicate that the primary responsibility of an elementary principal is to free himself of maintenance tasks by delegating many of these to competent office assistance or to his staff, so that he can better relate instructionally with the teachers. In large attendance centers, assistant principals, instructional area leaders, or department heads assist the principal and may be assigned supervisory, as well as maintenance responsibilities.

A review of the literature in supervision and in elementary administration shows little evidence to support that a "super vision" definition has been advocated by either theorists or practitioners. Self-assessment, involvement of staff, analysis of teaching, human relations, and morale, have permeated the literature for many years. Literature and research on change in education stress the need for involvement of teachers and administrators. No evidence has been found to indicate the elementary principals tend to practice supervisory techniques which could be classes as "show and tell with an air of authority and super vision".

Consequently it is held here that by the nature of his appointment to an administrative position, by the job definition prescribed by the Board of Education and/or the superintendent, and by the teaching and administrative experience and training he possesses, the elementary principal can serve in a supervisory capacity. However, in order to perform these supervisory functions, he needs to be provided with the time, the funds and the freedom to work with teachers to improve instruction. Advocates of special supervisory personnel imply that these additional personnel will spend more time with teachers and use different supervisory techniques than the mythical super vision definition connotes. The elementary principal can and should organize himself and his staff to gain these advantages. By using his staff as a team, he can help design appropriate professional growth plans and activities within a well-designed program of instructional improvement.

The degree to which the principal is sensitive to others and can perceive alternatives will determine his ability to analyze instruction and work with his teachers in self-assessment activities.

Supervision and evaluation

The complexity of the classroom learning situation—the capabilities of students, the diversity of materials, equipment and technology, and the administrative environment within which teaching takes place—makes judging instruction on an absolute basis of goodness or rightness impractical. To do so would exclude from consideration the important variables of the teacher's preparation, experience, personality, and personal attributes, which affect children (and parents). The degree to which teachers have been helped by principals or other supervisory personnel and the degree to which teachers feel free to use new teaching strategies must be considered in determining the extent to which individual teachers may grow. Recognizing the individuality of the teacher is as important or paramount as recognizing the individuality of students. If the elementary principal rates, judges, or evaluates teachers without appropriate consultation with them, his supervisory behavior connotes super vision. By providing opportunities for teachers

to interact with one another and by consulting with them frequently, the principal should be contributing to teachers developing a broader perspective of what teaching can become for them; they should have more teaching strategies and alternatives available from which to select and improve their instruction. This mutual assessment of teaching strategies and the assessment of their appropriateness prompts a discovery of *positive*, as well as questionable, teacher-teaching attributes and places supervision and evaluation in an inter-relationship of professional growth which should be observable in the teacher's future behavior. To diagnose without prescribing a treatment in consultation with the teacher is professional neglect.

The analysis of individual teacher behavior and teaching strategies permits the prescription of specific activities designed to assist the teacher in improving her instruction. The *variety* of opportunities needs to be considered rather than prescribing *a* workshop, conference, or class for "all" teachers. Groups of teachers may be formed to share growth activities of mutual concern to them. Activities should encompass personal, individual classroom, class or grade level, building, and/or system-wide concerns. They should be designed for both short-term (a semester or less) or long-term (a school year or longer) involvement, depending on the nature of the activity and needs of the staff. The degree to which any person becomes involved in any such activities should depend upon the assessment of his or her ability to contribute to or benefit from them.

Goals of evaluation of instruction

To suggest that supervision and evaluation of instruction have as their purpose the improvement of instruction may be redundant. To suggest that they do not take place to some degree is naive; to suggest that they become purposive, professional activities is good direction. These goals become:

Individual improvement of teacher behavior;
Individual improvement of teach*ing* behavior;
Assessment of strengths and weaknesses of the staff;
Assessment of strengths and weaknesses of the educational program;
Analysis of problem areas needing attention; and
Prescription of individual and group activities.

The principal's strategies become varied—as varied as the individuality of his staff and his own understanding of education and administration, as well as communication and interaction processes. To prescribe a set of strategies would be to establish a prescription for administrative behavior without considering its complexity. The principal must have at his personal disposal a variety of behavioral alternatives and be sufficiently perceptive and analytic to select those which promote those activities designed to reach the specified goals to improve instruction.

The Measurement Problem

Evaluation of the teacher is difficult because there are no absolutes in education. There is no universal agreement on what constitutes a good teacher, since evaluation implies measurement, and measurement implies the use of standards which are virtually non-existent in the educational setting.

Despite the problems involved, evaluation of the teacher progresses effectively in some districts and not so effectively in others. The purpose

of this position paper is not to develop new conceptual or theoretical bases for teacher evaluation, but to develop a procedural format as suggested by the ways in which teachers are actually being evaluated and to cite what observable teaching behaviors distinguish between the effective and ineffective teacher.

There is no substitute for classroom observation, for only by this means can supervisors gain first-hand knowledge and experience to make evaluations. Liebman states:

> "Of various techniques used by principals for supervising the program, none exceeds in effectiveness or in helpfulness than that of constructively purposeful visiting."*

Consistent and continuous contacts with teachers is basic to effective supervision. Above all, the supervisor must consider evaluation as a supportive role in the continuous growth of the teacher.

There seems to be a compulsion to use scales in evaluating. The difficulty with many "evaluative scales" is that they do not evaluate, and they are seldom scales. For the most part, they are restricted to objective measures which have rarely been investigated for their objectivity. Furthermore, scales may come close to rating, and there is a danger that teachers will regard them as such. Scales can be self-defeating, for the focus of attention may not be on mutual problem-solving by teachers and supervisors but may result in a game in which the teacher will make an attempt to impress or outsmart and fool his supervisor.

Prior to an attempt to evaluate the teacher, it may be well to explore the following items:

1. To what extent is the teacher's effectiveness related to the attitudes of his immediate supervisor?
2. To what extent is the teacher's effectiveness related to the sociological as well as the physical characteristics of the community?
3. To what extent is the teacher's effectiveness related to the children with whom he works?
4. To what extent is the teacher's effectiveness related to the physical plant and its instructional equipment?
5. To what extent is the teacher's effectiveness related to the educational philosophy prevalent in the school in which he serves?

How to Evaluate

Whether or not to evaluate teaching should not be a question which anyone in a supervisory position should ponder at length. Rather the issue to consider should be, "How to Evaluate?" A basic premise underlying evaluation of teaching should be that the purpose is to improve teaching. This implies that the starting point should be *where* the teacher *is*, not where he *should be*. The latter consideration represents some kind of goal, admittedly one which is not at all clearly defined. But the point which is crucial is that those in supervisory positions should evaluate the teaching performances of those with whom they are together responsible for the teaching of children.

---

*Malvina W. Liebman, "The Elementary School Principalship", 37th Yearbook, *The National Elementary Principal*, Washington, D.C., 1958, p. 34.

This committee unanimously embraced the opinion that evaluation should be of a cooperative and supportive nature. The purpose is not to compare teachers or rate teachers—the purpose is to improve teaching. This group believes that this objective is most efficiently nurtured in an atmosphere of cooperation, of mutual exchange of thoughts, and of mutual exchange of belief. Such dialogue should be two-way in nature, as opposed to one-way.

The following list of items is considered by this committee as being strategic to teacher evaluation. They are considered to be necessary, though not necessarily sufficient, in any consideration given to the effectiveness of teaching. IN NO CASE IS IT INTENDED THAT THIS LIST BE USED AS A RATING SCALE OR AS STANDARDS OF GOOD TEACHERS. Proper use requires the evaluator to make careful observation and to substantiate with positive or negative evidence.

EVALUATION OF TEACHER

1. The teacher demonstrates proper preparation and knowledge of current information in the subject areas taught.

Observations:

2. The teacher demonstrates a practical knowledge of the theories of learning, including educational psychology and up-to-date teaching techniques.

Observations:

3. The teacher demonstrates ability to plan for and use appropriate material for the motivation of the pupils.

Observations:

4. The teacher demonstrates an awareness of the human relations aspect of the role of the teacher, which includes an understanding of the needs and desires of children as well as parents.

Observations:

5. The teacher demonstrates an ability to establish a desirable climate for learning within the perimeter of the classroom, a display of an ability to discipline with understanding and with respect for human dignity.

Observations:

6. The teacher demonstrates a high regard for his chosen profession and the rights of his colleagues. That is a commitment to professionalism through adherence to the adopted code of ethics and loyalty to his professional organizations.

Observations:

7. The teacher demonstrates mental and emotional maturity, including a self concept which recognizes strengths as well as weaknesses. The teacher has self-esteem perceptible through appearance, speech and attitudes.

Observations:

8. Additional observations and comments.

EVALUATION OF TEACHING

1. Instructional Methods

   A. The teacher's behavior manifests consideration of individual differences.

   Observations:

   B. A variety of instructional procedures is evident.

   Observations:

   C. The major emphasis in the teaching is upon concepts and generalizations.

   Observations:

   D. The teacher demonstrates new knowledge of teaching procedures, subject matter, *et al* in her work.

   Observations:

   E. Consideration of learner readiness is evident as new learning tasks are approached.

   Observations:

   F. Appropriate remedial activities for children in need are evident.

   Observations:

   G. Practice work is meaningful and in appropriate amounts.

   Observations:

   H. Different approaches to problem-solving are evident, as opposed to a single approach.

   Observations:

   I. Both individual and group work are evident.

   Observations:

   J. The teacher works to foster attitudes which are consistent with the democratic philosophy.

   Observations:

2. Instructional Materials

   A. A variety of instructional materials is evident and in use.

   Observations:

   B. The teaching materials span a sufficient range of challenge for all pupils.

   Observations:

   C. The materials range from concrete in nature to abstract in nature.

   Observations:

   D. The materials are interesting to the learners and are geared to the various developmental levels of the group.

   Observations:

E. The materials are not out of date.
Observations:

F. The materials reflect the social realities.
Observations:

Application or Utilization

This position paper has been based upon ten assumptions. One of these indicates that it "should not be viewed as a program of evaluation or a set of absolute specifications for the evaluative process". Rather, an attempt has been made to describe the complexity of the supervisory role and its relationship to the complexity of teach*er* and teach*ing* variables. Definitive statements have been made which could and should foster curiosity and debate. It is not intended that this should be a "controversial" position, but rather an internally consistent position which can be used to promote controversy. The same assumption continues, "It serves best as a screen through which individual principals may find help in examining themselves, their beliefs, and their supervisory behavior." To this end perhaps, a "principal's self-assessment, self-concept" service has been performed.

Some may take issue with the committee in that no prescription or instrument or program is prescribed. Others may take issue with the committee in that the materials presented here leave too much yet to be done. This is precisely what *is* intended. The individuality of school systems, building and instructional units, teachers, elementary principals, and unique administrative structures preclude the establishment of an "absolute" position and would violate the assumptions which stress the individuality and readiness concepts of learning.

A position has been established. You, the elementary principals, have a rationale, implied roles, and guidelines from which to esteablish your *own* position paper. THIS MUST BE DONE if you are to have any internalized concept of evaluation of instruction and your supervisory self; to do less places you in the unenviable position of not defining your own supervisory parameters and not accepting responsibility for your own self-assessment and professional growth.

As elementary principals you have responsibility for participating in professional activities which will contribute to your district, your teachers, yourself, and ultimately in the "out-puts" of the educational program on its clients, the pupils. This position paper should have considerable potential for you in promoting in-service and study activities.

How recipients uses this instrument is limited only by their imagination, creativity and perception of their responsibilities. Listed below are some uses that have already been identified, you are challenged to determine others which could be unique to your particular needs. *Use:*

In administrative staff-council seminars at the district level;
In teacher association programs, study groups, workshops and institutes;
At district meetings of elementary principals;
As a theme and working paper for a State association/convention conference;
By boards of education studying teacher assessment and evaluation;
By parent-teacher study groups, programs; and
By a principal with his staff.

Use *for:*

Developing and articulating on individual's or group's rationale for evaluation;

Prescribing and setting alternate behavioral activities from which in-service activities can be selected;

Developing interaction of staff (group members) to foster group processes, involvement, sensitivity;

Analyzing the complexity of teaching and, especially, "good" teaching;

Developing evaluation guidelines to which groups or individuals become committed;

Developing a program of individual professional growth programs; individualizing in-service education; and

Fostering a survey of literature on evaluation, assessment, supervision and research related to these topics, as well as fostering study of "purposes of elementary education" and research techniques to evaluate accomplishment.

FOR THE PRINCIPAL'S BOOKSHELF

These suggested readings contain a veritable wealth of information and help as a principal, or any supervisor, goes about his important role of evaluation. Some of these materials go quite deeply into the matter of evaluation, with its many-faceted character. In price, they range from a few cents to several dollars. Of course, it is recommended that as many of the materials as possible be examined before selection(s) is (are) made.

Amidon, Edmund J., *The Role of the Teacher in the Classroom*, Minneapolis: Paul S. Amidon and Associates, Inc., 1963.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, "Better Than Rating", Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1950.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, *Leadership for Improving Instruction* (1960 Yearbook), Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1960.

Bartky, John A., *Supervision as Human Relations*, D. C. Heath and Company, 1953.

Bell, Terrel Howard, *Effective Teaching: How to Recognize and Reward Competence*, New York: Exposition Press, 1962.

Bellack, Arno A., *Theory and Research in Teaching*, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

Biddle, Bruce J. and William J. Ellena, eds., *Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Burgess, T. C., *Teacher Behavior Ratings as a Criterion of Teacher Effectiveness*, Technical Report #1, Columbia, Missouri, University of Missouri, Department of Psychology, May, 1953.

Burnham, Reba M. and Martha L. King, *Supervision in Action*, Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, N.E.A., 1961.

Crosby, Muriel E., *Supervision as Cooperative Action*, Appleton-Century, Crofts, Inc., 1957.

Curtin, James, *Supervision in Today's Elementary Schools*, New York: The Macmillan Company.

Franseth, Jane, *Supervision as Leadership*, New York: Row, Peterson & Co., 1961.

Gage, N. L., ed., *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, Chicago: Rand McNally & Co. 1963.

Gwynn, J. Minor, *Theory and Practice of Supervision*, New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. 1964.

Harris, Ben M., *Supervisory Behavior in Education*, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Periodical

Herman, Wayne L., "Teacher Observation", *National Elementary Principal*, April, 1964, pp. 63-64.

Kyte, George C., "This is the kind of supervision that teachers welcome and appreciate", *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 48, July, 1951, pp. 33-34.

Lucio, William H. and John D. McNeil, *Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1962.

Medley, D. M. and Mitzel, H. E., *Studies of Teacher Behavior: The Refinement of Two Techniques for Observing Teachers' Classroom Behaviors*, Publication #28, New York. Office of Research and Evaluation—College of the City of New York, 1955.

National Education Association, "The Professional Family", Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1965.

Neagley, Ross L. and N. Bruce Evans, *Handbook of Supervision*, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Redfern, George B., *How to Appraise Teaching Performance*, Columbus, Ohio: School Management Institute, 1963.

Reeder, Edwin H., *Supervision in the Elementary School*, Chicago: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1953.

Remmers, *et al*, *Second Report of the Committee on Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness*, Journal of Educational Research, 46:9, May, 1953, pp. 644-654.

Simpson, Ray H. and Jerome M. Seidman, *Student Evaluation of Teaching and Learning*, Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1962.

Simpson, Ray H., *Teacher Self-Evaluation*, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1966.

Stoops, Emery and James R. Marks, *Elementary School Supervision—Practices and Trends*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1962.